

Use of comments

Running head: USE OF COMMENTS

CORRELATES OF COLLEGE STUDENTS' USE OF INSTRUCTOR COMMENTS

By Eric M. Wiltse
Senior Lecturer
Communication and Journalism Department.
University of Wyoming

Submitted to Journalism and Mass Communication Educator

Introduction

Most writing researchers agree that providing feedback to students is an effective way to improve writing from grade school to college. However, when reading instructors' comments on their stories, students are faced with interpreting what the notations mean and how they should use the suggestions to revise stories. Written comments also concern their teachers, who spend hours providing detailed feedback on both writing quality and content in hopes that students will improve their subsequent drafts.

Many journalism students use their teachers' feedback to polish and refine second drafts of their articles. Some students ignore their teachers' feedback, while others simply refuse to use the comments during the revision process. Still more may be confused and not understand the feedback. Overeager students may misinterpret the comments and make new errors on second drafts.

Instructors find that constructive criticism can increase some students' self-efficacy beliefs in their ability to write and motivate them to work harder and improve their writing. However, the same comments that were intended to be constructive can cause other students to dislike writing and to give up trying to improve subsequent drafts. Those students may even develop writing apprehension as a result of feedback. Writing apprehension seems to be more common in poor writers than in skilled writers, although it is possible that poor writing skills may lead to writing apprehension. Furthermore, writing apprehension can begin at a young age and become a lifelong problem.

Journalism teachers who are aware of students suffering from writing apprehension or students with high self-efficacy beliefs in their ability to write may be able to provide more effective feedback. Since many journalism teachers provide

extensive feedback on both the writing mechanics and content of their students' stories, it would benefit instructors to understand the relationships among writing apprehension, writing self-efficacy, and students' use of instructors' comments.

Considering the close scrutiny that journalism instructors give to their students' stories, it is surprising that so little attention has been paid to the relationships among feedback and students' affective writing constructs. The driving force behind the current study stemmed from an interest in how to provide more effective, relevant feedback to students. This research investigated the claims of previous studies that students tend to use certain types of feedback and ignore others when revising rough drafts. However, this study considered feedback use in light of individuals' writing apprehension, self-efficacy beliefs, and writing outcomes expectations, defined as the value individuals place on writing to achieve goals.

This study will examine student use of global and local feedback. Straub and Lunsford categorized global feedback as comment upon a written composition's content, such as the ideas, development and organization.¹ Local feedback is a comment on mechanical writing issues. Straub's study of 147 freshman writing students indicated that students preferred comments on both local and global matters.²

Daly found that people with high levels of writing apprehension tend to be poor writers compared to people with moderate or low levels.³ Furthermore, according to Daly, poor writers often have a history of receiving negative feedback on their writings. Flower and Hayes noted that poor writers may concentrate more on spelling or other mechanical tasks than on the content of their compositions.⁴ In a case study of a high-

apprehensive writer, Selfe also observed that she seemed more concerned with avoiding mechanical errors than with the thematic soundness of her composition.⁵

McCarthy, Meier, and Rinderer found a strong relationship between high self-efficacy beliefs in one's writing abilities and writing performance.⁶ The researchers also noted that self-efficacy is partly a result of feedback students have received about the quality of their writing. If high self-efficacy writers also tend to be good writers, they may have transferred knowledge about writing mechanics into long-term memory, freeing themselves to deal more with content and structural matters in their writing assignments, according to Flower and Hayes.⁷

Many researchers, including Daly and Wilson, Onwuegbuzie, and Pajares and Johnson have found inverse relationships between writing apprehension and various self-esteem constructs, including self-efficacy.⁸

Students' expectations of how writing can help them accomplish their goals, both intrinsic and extrinsic, also may play a role in how they process instructor feedback. Vroom theorized that people who expect to receive rewards, or outcomes, as a result of their efforts will be motivated to expend more effort on the task at hand. People who do not expect much reward from their efforts will lack motivation and not try hard.⁹ For writing students, those rewards could include grades, praise, and good jobs. Journalism students, in particular, should have high outcomes expectations because many have goals of working in the mass media after graduation.

The purpose of the current study was to explore the correlates of college writing students' use of instructor comments. The following research question was considered: What are the interrelationships among writing apprehension, writing outcomes

expectations, writing self-efficacy beliefs, and students' use of global and local feedback from instructors when students revise first drafts of news stories?

Literature Review

Writing researchers frequently mention the amounts of time instructors spend on student papers providing comments that are either ignored or not used in revised drafts. Instructors become further frustrated when students simply delete problematic passages rather than rewrite them, despite the instructor's suggestions for revision, noted Ziv.¹⁰

Although one of the tenets of the 1990s' writing-across-the-curriculum movement is that writing is improved by the opportunity to get feedback on a first draft before turning in a paper for a grade, McKeachie noted that students can become “overloaded” with instructors' feedback, causing them to ignore some comments.¹¹ Furthermore, Dohrer found that students often misunderstand teachers' intentions in written comments.¹² Students revised papers mainly to get higher grades by meeting what they perceived to be the expectations of their teachers, based upon written comments. He concluded that many students were not confident in their abilities to revise papers; in other words, they had low writing self-efficacy beliefs.

Instructor feedback also can have a powerful effect on students' emotions, especially writing apprehension, motivation, and their beliefs about writing and their own skills as writers, according to McLeod.¹³ The literature generally agrees that instructor feedback can inspire and motivate students to work harder on improving their writing. According to Bandura, a person's confidence in his or her ability to perform a task, or self-efficacy belief, plays a large role in motivation. Bandura, as well as Shell, Murphy, and Bruning, and Pajares and Johnson, argued that self-efficacy is task- and context-

specific; for example, a person may have high self-efficacy beliefs in math but not in writing.¹⁴ Writing self-efficacy consists of three components -- writing skills, tasks and outcomes expectations, according to Shell, Murphy, and Bruning.¹⁵ Writing skills self-efficacy beliefs are students' confidence in their ability to successfully perform certain writing mechanics, such as spelling and punctuation. Writing task self-efficacy beliefs are students' confidence in their ability to successfully complete specific writing problems, such as a job resume. Writing outcomes expectations are how students rate the importance of writing for achieving various life goals, such as getting a job.

Writing apprehension is a construct that attempts to differentiate people who find writing enjoyable and those who experience high levels of apprehension when writing is required, according to Daly and Miller.¹⁶ Relating the construct to feedback, Faigley, Daly, and Witte defined writing apprehension as "a construct associated with a person's tendencies to approach or avoid situations that require writing accompanied by some amount of evaluation."¹⁷ Writing apprehension may be so severe for some students that they ignore an instructor's feedback because of a history of failure on writing assignments, Daly found. Instructor comments may not only cause apprehension in students, but may paralyze their efforts to improve their writing in the future.¹⁸ Lackey, Miller and Flanigan stated that feedback can motivate students to improve writing performance, but that much written feedback lowers motivation instead.¹⁹

How students react to feedback is a particular concern in journalism classes because instructors tend to note every mechanical and content error. "Poorly written and badly organized stories deter readers from gaining information that may be essential to their well-being," according to Fox.²⁰ As a result, many journalism students may be

overwhelmed by instructor feedback. In particular, a weak writer who needs the most help but whose papers receive the most teacher comments may view the graded paper as a “messy autopsy” with the instructor as “coroner,” wrote Grant-Davie and Shapiro, and the student may even develop writing apprehension.²¹

Most studies on writing apprehension and self-efficacy have come from the English composition field. But composition classes differ from journalism classes in terms of audience. Much composition writing is private, such as keeping journals, while journalism writing is intended for a mass audience. Composition students commonly write essays in which they express their ideas, while journalism students write stories based upon facts, Riffe and Stacks noted.²² As a product for public consumption, with many critical and alert readers, journalism students’ stories not only must be factually correct and complete, but well written. “A good journalist gets the mechanics right because that is what the audience understands,” stated Berner.²³

Pitts noted that journalism students usually write for their teacher as the audience. Students tend to look for mechanical errors rather than clarity of meaning. Pitts urged teaching methods that incorporate more interaction between the instructor and students during the writing process.²⁴ Some research has focused upon the importance of establishing a two-way dialogue about writing between students and teachers so teachers don’t take control of the student’s writing through feedback, noted Fey and Ziv.²⁵

Flower examined how affect, including self-image, emotion, motivation and attitudes, influences student writing. Reflecting the powerful role that affect plays, some students described their writing processes as “dilemma-driven action” rather than problem-solving strategies. Students also reported having little or no sense of control of

these feelings, and attributed their success or failure at writing to external factors, such as luck or time.²⁶

A study based upon Bandura's self-efficacy theory of motivation found that students will benefit from written teacher feedback when they perceive that acting upon the comments will improve their ability or improve their performance. Receiving feedback about the quality of their writing helps students develop their writing self-efficacy.²⁷

Daly and Wilson suggested that evaluation, which is a form of feedback, plays a part in forming a person's self-esteem, and that a history of positive evaluations will generally lead to higher self-esteem. Conversely, a history of poor evaluations could result in negative feelings toward oneself. However, Pajares and Johnson found the writing apprehension levels of the students did not change even though their performance and sense of self-efficacy improved.²⁸

Sogunro noted that psychologists have found that a moderate level of anxiety can be beneficial to learning because it increases motivation, heightens alertness and concentration, and thereby improves performance. However, other students can be crippled by higher levels, and their academic performances may suffer as a result.²⁹

Bandura contended that the expected outcomes of an action depend largely on a person's judgment of his or her self-efficacy.³⁰ In other words, perceived rewards or punishments result from how competent people believe themselves to be in performing an act. If students believe they are capable of covering a news event, they probably expect the outcome will be praise from the instructor and a high grade. Students who

doubt their ability to cover the event likely expect lesser rewards or even penalties. Doubtful students may not try as hard to interview people or take notes at the event.

Research has indicated that self-efficacy beliefs may better predict writing performance than do outcomes expectations. Factor analysis by Shell, Murphy, and Bruning found that while self-efficacy was a significant predictor of writing performance ($p < .01$), outcomes expectations were not significant, supporting Bandura's theory. Pajares and Johnson also found no correspondence between students' writing self-efficacy and their outcomes expectations. Students' perceived usefulness of writing was unrelated to their writing confidence.³¹

Hypotheses

Based upon the literature review, several hypotheses seemed sensible. In general, writing apprehension, writing self-efficacy, and writing goals should be related to whether mass communication students will use instructor comments for revision.

H1: There will be positive correlations among writing apprehension, writing self-efficacy beliefs, and writing outcomes expectations.

H2: Writing apprehension, writing self-efficacy, and writing outcomes expectations will be significant predictors of whether mass communication students report they will use global comments from their instructors when revising first drafts.

H3: Writing apprehension, writing self-efficacy, and writing outcomes expectations will be significant predictors of whether mass communication students report they will use local comments from their instructors when revising first drafts.

Methodology

Student use of instructor feedback was measured by the score on an instrument that asked students to rate their use of local or global teacher comments. The instrument was similar to Straub's questionnaire, which asked students to rate their preferences for teacher comments written on an essay, but not whether they would use the comments in revision.³² The Straub instrument was modified for this study to reflect the type of writing mass communication students do -- journalistic writing. A short news story adapted from *The Copy Editor's Handbook* was used with 10 teacher comments written on it (See Appendix A).³³ Five comments dealt with local issues and five involved global matters. For example, a local comment was "Is style correct?" A global comment was "Relevance? Do police suspect it's hate crime?" A questionnaire with the rating choices on it listed the 10 comments. The four choices to rate each item were worded: 1 - definitely will use, 2 - might use, 3 - probably won't use, and 4 - definitely won't use. The average scores for the five global comment use items and for the five local comment use items were both calculated. Before being used for the study, the instrument was pilot-tested for validity and reliability. In a pilot of undergraduate journalism students ($n = 20$), a Cronbach alpha of .76 was calculated for the instrument, which was considered an acceptable degree of reliability. Item analysis revealed that each item score was positively correlated with the total-scale scores. Six items had statistically significant correlations ranging from $r = .595$ to $r = .795$. Four were local comments and two were global. Non-significant correlations on the other four items ranged from $r = .207$ to $r = .409$. The two items with the lowest correlations ($r = .207$, $r = .224$) were rephrased before the instrument was used in the study.

Writing apprehension was measured by the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Test, which has been found to be valid and reliable in numerous studies. Scores on the twenty-six-item instrument may range from a low of 26 to a high of 130. High scores indicated low levels of writing apprehension.

Writing self-efficacy was measured by three instruments developed by Shell et al. to measure writing skills self-efficacy, writing tasks self-efficacy and writing outcomes expectations. The instruments have been found to be valid and reliable in other studies. The eight-item writing skills and twenty-item writing tasks instruments allow participants to choose a score from 0 (no chance) to 100 (completely certain) to rate their self-efficacy. Scores were then averaged. The writing outcomes expectations instrument used a seven-point Likert scale ranging from extremely unimportant to extremely important. Scores were calculated by averaging the ratings across all twenty items. High scores indicated high self-efficacy beliefs and writing outcomes expectations.³⁴

Results

Descriptive Analyses

The instruments and a demographic questionnaire were completed by 181 students attending a 12,000-enrollment university in the Rocky Mountain region in May, 2000. The sample consisted of 104 females and 77 males enrolled in six mass media courses offered by the communication and mass media department. Seven surveys had one incomplete item in the instruments. In those cases, the average score for that item was used. The mean age was 21.1 years old ($SD = 3.62$) with ages ranging from 18 to 57. Caucasians composed the largest ethnic group, 92.3%, in the study ($n = 167$).

The majority of students in the study, 52.5%, were majoring in the communication and mass media department ($n = 95$), with 58 listing communication, 27 journalism and 10 broadcasting as their majors. The remaining 47.5% ($n = 86$) majored in other academic areas or were undeclared. Participating in the study were 39 freshmen or 21.5% of the sample, 48 sophomores or 26.5%, 49 juniors or 27.1%, and 45 seniors or 24.9%. Only 25.4% ($n = 46$) had taken just one of the three required writing courses at the university, while 88 had taken two and 40 had taken three. Seven participants did not respond to the question.

The mean grade point average in the required freshman composition course was 3.33 ($SD = .68$). More than 84 percent of the students ($n = 153$) reported they received a final grade of A or B. Only 19 students or 10.5% reported a C grade, and one student said he or she received a D. Eight respondents did not report a grade.

The mean score on the 100-point writing tasks self-efficacy subscale was 75.91 ($SD = 12.16$). Scores ranged from 43 to 100. The mean score on the 100-point writing skills self-efficacy subscale was 87.17 ($SD = 11.88$). Scores ranged from 32.5 to 100. For further data analysis, the twenty-eight items composing the writing skills and writing tasks self-efficacy subscales were averaged into a single score. The resulting predictor variable was named Efficacy. The mean for the full-scale Efficacy scores was 79.13 ($SD = 10.53$), and scores ranged from 49.29 to 98.93.

The mean score on the seven-point writing outcomes expectations instrument was 4.90 ($SD = 1.04$). Scores ranged from 1.65 to 7.00. The predictor variable was named Outcome.

Scores on the writing apprehension test (WAT) were recoded for data analysis so high scores indicated high levels of writing apprehension. The mean score was 34.98 (SD = 16.39) on a possible scale from 1 to 105. Scores ranged from 1 to 81.

Mean scores for local (Local) and global (Global) feedback use were recoded so high scores indicated that students reported high use of instructor feedback. The global feedback mean score was 3.23 (SD = .46) on a scale from 1.0 to 4.0. Scores ranged from 1.8 to 4.0. The local feedback mean score was 3.53 (SD = .42) on a scale from 1.0 to 4.0. Scores ranged from 2.2 to 4.0.

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed among the three writing construct measures (Efficacy, WAT, Outcome). The tests were one-tailed with a level of significance set at .05 alpha. The results of the correlational analyses presented in Table 1 reveal that the three correlations were statistically significant and were greater than or equal to .208. In general, the results suggest that students with low levels of writing apprehension tend to have high self-efficacy beliefs in their writing ability and high writing outcomes expectations.

Table 1: Correlations among Writing Outcomes Expectations, Writing Apprehension, Writing Self-Efficacy Beliefs

	Outcome	WAT	Efficacy
Outcome			
WAT	-.245**		
Efficacy	.208**	-.518**	

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Regression Analyses

Two multiple regression analyses were conducted to evaluate how well the measures of the three writing constructs predicted student use of instructor comments. It should be noted that the distribution of scores for local feedback use was positively skewed. The distribution of scores for global feedback use also was positively skewed, but to a lesser degree. Therefore, the results of the multiple regressions could be erroneous because the criterion variables were not normally distributed. However, as Pedhazur noted, "It has been demonstrated that regression analysis is generally robust in the presence of departures from assumptions, except for measurement errors and specification errors."³⁵ The instruments used to measure the variables in the current have been found to be reliable and, therefore, accurate regarding measurement. Concerning specification errors, the regression equation model in the current study is linear and, therefore, tenable.

In the first multiple regression, the three predictor variables were writing apprehension (WAT), writing self-efficacy (Efficacy) and writing outcomes expectations (Outcome), while the criterion variable was global feedback use (Global). The linear combination of the three writing construct measures was significantly related to global feedback use, $F(3,177) = 4.16$, $p = .007$. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .26, indicating that about 7 percent of the variance in student use of global instructor comments can be explained by the linear combination of the three writing constructs.

The indices in Table 2 indicate the relative strength of the three predictors. Two of the bivariate correlations between the writing constructs and global feedback use were negative, and two of the three correlations were statistically significant ($p < .05$). The partial correlation between writing apprehension and global feedback use was significant.

It might be concluded, based upon the correlational analyses, that writing apprehension is the only useful predictor for global feedback use. The writing apprehension measure accounted for about 6 percent ($.246^2 = .06$) of the variance in student use of global instructor comments. However, judging the relative importance of the predictor variables is difficult because they are correlated.

Table 2. Bivariate and Partial Correlations of the Predictors with Global Feedback Use

Predictors	Correlation between each predictor and global feedback use	Correlation between each predictor and global feedback use controlling for all other predictors
Efficacy	-.156*	-.03
WAT	.246**	.18*
Outcome	-.125	-.07

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

In the second multiple regression, the three predictor variables again were writing apprehension (WAT), writing self-efficacy beliefs (Efficacy), and writing outcomes expectations (Outcome), while the criterion variable was local feedback use (Local). The linear combination of the three writing construct measures was significantly related to student use of local instructor comments, $F(3,177) = 5.02$, $p = .002$. The sample multiple correlation coefficient was .28, indicating that about 8 percent of the variance in student use of local instructor comments can be accounted for by the linear combination of the three writing constructs.

The indices in Table 3 indicate that two of the bivariate correlations between the writing constructs and local feedback use were negative, and two of the three correlations were statistically significant ($p < .05$). The partial correlation between writing

apprehension and local feedback use was significant. The writing apprehension measure accounted for about 7 percent ($.273^2 = .07$) of the variance in student use of local instructor comments. Again, however, it is difficult to gauge the relative importance of the predictor variables because they are correlated.

Table 3. Bivariate and Partial Correlations of the Predictors with Local Feedback Use

Predictors	Correlation between each predictor and local feedback use	Correlation between each predictor and local feedback use controlling for all other predictors
Efficacy	-.181*	-.04
WAT	.273**	.20**
Outcome	-.111	-.04

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Discussion

The results of this study were consistent with previous studies in that they demonstrated the importance of affective writing constructs in the writing process. In particular, the results support previous research that found significant, negative correlations between writing apprehension and various measures of self-esteem, including self-efficacy.³⁶ As hypothesized, writing apprehension had statistically significant ($p < .01$) and negative correlations with writing outcomes expectations and writing self-efficacy beliefs. That result is not surprising in that students with low levels of writing apprehension might be expected to also have high levels of self-efficacy beliefs in their writing abilities, and students with high writing apprehension would have lower levels of self-efficacy. The correlation between writing apprehension and writing self-efficacy beliefs was moderate in magnitude ($r = -.518$), suggesting there may be

practical significance to the relationship. Students with low writing apprehension also placed high value on writing toward reaching various goals, the results suggest. However, the relationship between writing apprehension and writing outcomes expectations ($r = -.245$) was low in strength. Although the statistically significant result was hypothesized, the low correlation is somewhat unexpected because students with low writing apprehension supposedly should place a higher value on writing to attain various goals in life.

Contrary to previous findings and social-cognitive theory, this study found a statistically significant correlation between the self-efficacy beliefs and writing outcomes expectations, therefore supporting Hypothesis One. Bandura concluded that self-efficacy beliefs were more important than outcome expectations in motivating persons to act. Supporting Bandura's observation, Pajares and Johnson found no significant correlation between writing self-efficacy and outcomes expectations.³⁷ Although the correlation in the current study was low in magnitude ($r = .208$), the results suggest that mass communication students who have high self-efficacy beliefs in their writing skills also value writing as a way to attain goals. This result is not surprising, considering that many students in the sample probably plan to pursue mass media careers. To attain that goal, they likely have taken several writing courses, practiced writing skills in and out of the classroom, such as in internships, and have developed self-confidence in their writing abilities. In comparison, the sample in the Pajares and Johnson study consisted of 30 education majors, who may not have had either the writing skills or writing practice as the sample of mass communication students.

The findings of this study contributed beyond previous studies in three major ways. First, it extended findings to a sample of mass communication students. These students presumably will face more writing situations in college than a broader sample of college students, therefore constituting a group that may have unique educational experiences.

Second, the study expanded upon previous work that examined the relationships among affective writing constructs. The current study demonstrated that the three major writing affects identified through the literature -- writing apprehension, self-efficacy and outcomes expectations -- may not influence whether students will follow an instructor's suggestions when they rewrite first drafts of news stories. Writing apprehension, the only significant predictor variable, only accounted for 6-7% of the variability in student use of both local and global instructor feedback. Neither writing self-efficacy beliefs nor outcomes expectations were predictive of student use of local or global feedback in the regression model. While writing apprehension seems to be the best predictor among the three variables, apparently there are other factors that account for the rest of the variance in student use of instructor comments. Therefore, the results only partially supported Hypotheses Two and Three, and warrant further research into other predictors of student use of instructor comments for revision.

And third, the study represented an exploratory attempt to examine how affective writing constructs influence students' use of instructor comments when revising first drafts. Previous studies examined how the affective constructs affect students' overall writing performance, rather than students' use of instructor feedback as an integral part of the writing process.³⁸ Because journalism instructors comment extensively on their

students' stories, and because instructor feedback is considered an important pedagogic tool in the writing process, further research into how students use those comments seems warranted. The current study also builds upon Straub's work, which found that students reported they prefer both global and local comments from instructors.³⁹ Students in the current study generally reported that they might or definitely would use both global and local comments during revision.

The generalizability of the findings may be limited. Considering the unique nature of the sample (i.e. mainly Caucasian, mass communication students in a rural state university), the findings could be very different for another sample, such as mixed-ethnicity, urban students in other fields of study. Furthermore, the correlational research design would not permit one to state with any confidence that self-efficacy, outcomes expectations, or writing apprehension cause student use of different types of feedback. Although the researcher followed recommended procedures to make the feedback instrument valid and reliable, it is possible that the instrument lacks internal consistency, failed to discriminate adequately among different student characteristics, or simply failed to actually measure whether students would use global or local feedback.

For further study, populations of high and low apprehension writers could be identified. Samples drawn from those populations could be randomly assigned to treatment and control groups to more accurately assess the causes of use of feedback. The sample for this study may not be representative of the general population of undergraduate mass communication students. Replication of the study with a different sample that is more heterogenous on writing skills and writing apprehension in particular is recommended.

Students in this sample generally reported that they definitely would use or might use both focuses of instructor comments to fix mechanical and content problems in their second drafts. But, in practice, writing teachers note how few changes many students make in subsequent drafts despite receiving extensive instructor comments on earlier drafts. Future research also could examine why students say they would use instructor comments to improve second drafts, but in practice, do not use them.

NOTES

1. Richard Straub and Ronald F. Lunsford, *Twelve Readers Reading: Responding to College Student Writing* (NJ: Hampton Press, 1995).
2. Richard Straub, "Students' Reaction to Teacher Comments: An Exploratory Study," *Research in the Teaching of English* 31 (Feb. 1997): 91-119.
3. John A. Daly, "The Effects of Writing Apprehension on Message Encoding," *Journalism Quarterly* 55 (autumn 1977): 566-72.
4. Linda S. Flower and John R. Hayes, "A Cognitive Process Theory," *College Composition and Communication* 32 (Dec. 1981): 365-87.
5. Cynthia L. Selfe, (1985). "An Apprehensive Writer Composes," in *When a Writer Can't Write*, ed. Mike Rose (NY: The Guilford Press, 1985), 83-95.
6. Patricia McCarthy, Scott Meier, and Regina Rinderer, "Self-efficacy and Writing: A Different View of Self-evaluation," *College Composition and Communication* 36 (Dec. 1985): 465-71.
7. Flower and Hayes, "Cognitive Process Theory."
8. John A. Daly and Deborah A. Wilson, "Writing Apprehension, Self-esteem and Personality," *Research in the Teaching of English* 17 (Dec. 1983): 327-341; Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie, "Writing Apprehension Among Graduate Students: Its Relationship to Self-Perceptions," *Psychological Reports* 84 (June 1999): 1034-39; M. Frank Pajares and Margaret J. Johnson, "Confidence and Competence in Writing: The Role of Self-efficacy, Outcome Expectancy, and Apprehension," *Research in the Teaching of English* 28 (Oct. 1994): 313-31.
9. Victor H. Vroom, "Industrial Social Psychology," in *Management and Motivation*, ed. Victor Vroom and Edward Deci (MD: Penguin Books Inc., 1970), 91-106.
10. Nina D. Ziv, "What She Thought I Said: How Students Misperceive Teachers' Written Comments," East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215 361, 1982)
11. Wilbert J. McKeachie, *Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers* (MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1999), 138.
12. Gary Dohrer, "Do Teachers' Comments on Students' Papers Help?" *College Teaching* 39 (spring 1991): 48-54.
13. Susan McLeod, "Some Thoughts About Feelings: The Affective Domain and the Writing Process," *College Composition and Communication* 38 (Dec. 1987): 426-35.
14. Albert Bandura, *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory* (NJ: Prentice Hall, 1986); Duane F. Shell, Carolyn C. Murphy and Roger H. Bruning, "Self-efficacy and Outcome Expectancy Mechanisms in Reading and Writing Achievement," *Journal of Educational Psychology* 81 (March 1989): 91-100; Pajares and Johnson, "Confidence and Competence in Writing."
15. Shell, Murphy and Bruning, "Self-efficacy and Outcome Expectancy."
16. John A. Daly and Michael D. Miller, "The Empirical Development of an Instrument to Measure Writing Apprehension," *Research in the Teaching of English* 9 (Winter 1975): 242-49.
17. Lester Faigley, John A. Daly and Witte, S.P. "The Effects of Writing Apprehension on Writing Performance and Competence," *Journal of Educational Research* 75 (Sept./Oct. 1981): 16.
18. John A. Daly, "Writing Apprehension and Writing Competency," *The Journal of Educational Research* 72 (Sept./Oct. 1978): 10-14.
19. James R. Lackey, Raymond B. Miller, and Michael C. Flanigan, "The Effects of Written Feedback on Motivation and Changes in Written Performance," East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 406 690, 1997)
20. Walter Fox, *Writing the News: A Guide for Print Journalists* (IA: Iowa State University Press, 1993), vii.
21. Keith Grant-Davie and Nancy Shapiro, "Curing the Nervous Tick: Reader-based Response to Student Writing," East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 282 196, 1987): 6.
22. Daniel Riffe and Don W. Stacks, "Dimensions of Writing Apprehension among Mass Communication Students," *Journalism Quarterly* 65 (summer 1988): 384-91; Daniel Riffe and Don W. Stacks, "Student Characteristics and Writing Apprehension," *Journalism Educator* 47 (Summer, 1992): 39-49.
23. R. Thomas Berner, *The Process of Writing News* (MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1992), 2.
24. Beverley Pitts, "Model for News Writing Process," *Journalism Educator* 44 (spring 1989): 12-19, 59.

-
- 25 Marion H. Fey, "Reader Response, Collaborative Writing, and Computer Networking," East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 364 875, 1993); Nina D. Ziv, "The Effect of Teacher Comments on the Writing of Four College Freshmen," in *New Directions in Composition Research*, ed. Richard Beach and Lillian S. Bridwell (NY: Guildford Press, 1984), 362-80.
- 26 Linda Flower, *The Construction of Negotiated Meaning: A Social Cognitive Theory of Writing* (IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994), 243.
- 27 Bandura, *Social Foundations of Thought and Action*; Lackey, Miller, and Flanigan, "Effects of Written Feedback;" McCarthy, Meier, and Rinderer, "Self-efficacy and Writing."
- 28 Daly and Wilson, "Writing Apprehension, Self-esteem and Personality;" Pajares and Johnson, "Confidence and Competence in Writing."
- 29 Olusegun A. Sogunro, "Impact of Evaluation Anxiety on Adult Learning," *Journal of Research and Development in Education* 31 (Winter 1998): 109-120.
- 30 Bandura, *Social Foundations of Thought and Action*.
- 31 Shell, Murphy, and Bruning, "Self-efficacy and Outcome Expectancy;" Pajares and Johnson, "Confidence and Competence in Writing."
- 32 Straub, "Students' Reaction to Teacher Comments."
- 33 Anthony R. Fellow and Thomas N. Clanin, *Copy Editors' Handbook for Newspapers* (CO: Morton Publishing Co., 1998).
- 34 Shell, Murphy, and Bruning, "Self-efficacy and Outcome Expectancy."
- 35 Elazar J. Pedhazur, *Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research: Explanation and Prediction* (TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982), 34.
- 36 Daly and Wilson, "Writing Apprehension, Self-esteem and Personality;" Pajares and Johnson, "Confidence and Competence in Writing;" Onwuegbuzie, "Writing Apprehension Among Graduate Students."
- 37 Bandura, *Social Foundations of Thought and Action*; Pajares and Johnson, "Confidence and Competence in Writing."
- 38 Shell, Murphy, and Bruning, "Self-efficacy and Outcome Expectancy;" Pajares and Johnson, "Confidence and Competence in Writing."
- 39 Straub, "Students' Reaction to Teacher Comments."

APPENDIX A

STUDENT USE OF INSTRUCTOR FEEDBACK INSTRUMENT

BACKGROUND: I am conducting research on instructor feedback and writing assignments. Research indicates that students will use some teacher comments on their rough drafts to make changes in second drafts of their papers. However, students will ignore other teacher comments and not make changes in second drafts.

I want to look at what students think about teacher comments. For this project, I am particularly interested in finding out which kinds of comments you would or would not use for writing a second draft of the following story.

INSTRUCTIONS: Assume that you are getting back a first draft that you have written for a journalism class and are going to revise for a final draft.

Which comments from your instructor would you actually use for revising your story? Which comments would you not use? Read the story and teacher comments, and then rate the comments on the attached questionnaire. Rate the comments on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being definitely will use and 4 being definitely will not use.

NOTE: Comments were handwritten on original instrument. They are written in italics for this appendix.

A teenager was arrested Thursday for allegedly shooting a friend during an argument over who would drive the car they had just stolen. (1. *Where did incident happen?*)

Bobby Baston, 18, allegedly shot Paul Hvastkovs, (*Did you verify name spelling?*) 18, in a parking lot, where they had driven a car they took from a 7-Eleven store about 5 p.m. He was shot in the arm, according to the police report. (3. *Was he hospitalized?*)

The car belonged to Martha Katz, of 345 18th St., Mountain View. Katz admitted to cops that she left her keys in her 1994 Chevy. (4. *Should you call them cops?*)

"I wasn't going to be gone that long, and I shouldn't have to worry about thieves, said Katz. (5. *Where does quote end?*)

Katz, who is black, said she ran into the 7-Eleven to buy a six-pack. (6. *Relevance? Do police suspect it's hate crime?*)

With Hvastkovs driving, the boys took the car back to their high school to show to friends, Police Dect. (7. *Is style correct?*) Bob Chavez said. Chavez said the boys found a loaded gun in the car's glove box when Hvastkovs refused to let Baston drive the car, Baston grabbed the gun and shot Hvastkovs. (8. *I don't understand sentence.*)

Chavez said drugs were found in the car during a police search. He did not know the value or amount of the drugs. (9. *Whose drugs were they?*)

Several North High School students witnessed the arrest. One student, who refused to give his name, said the suspects had stolen money from his school locker and used it to buy drugs. (10. *Verify anonymous information with police.*)

INSTRUCTIONS: The teacher comments in the above story correspond with the comments below. Which teacher comments would you actually use to revise the story? Please indicate whether you would actually use the teacher comments for revising the first draft by circling one of the descriptors.

- | | | |
|--|-------------|--|
| 1. Where did incident happen? | | |
| 1-definitely will use | 2-Might use | 3- Probably won't use 4-definitely won't use |
| 2. Did you verify name spelling? | | |
| 1-definitely will use | 2-Might use | 3- Probably won't use 4-definitely won't use |
| 3. Was he hospitalized? | | |
| 1-definitely will use | 2-Might use | 3- Probably won't use 4-definitely won't use |
| 4. Should you call them cops? | | |
| 1-definitely will use | 2-Might use | 3- Probably won't use 4-definitely won't use |
| 5. Where does quote end? | | |
| 1-definitely will use | 2-Might use | 3- Probably won't use 4-definitely won't use |
| 6. Relevance? Do police suspect it's hate crime? | | |
| 1-definitely will use | 2-Might use | 3- Probably won't use 4-definitely won't use |
| 7. Is style correct? | | |
| 1-definitely will use | 2-Might use | 3- Probably won't use 4-definitely won't use |
| 8. I don't understand sentence. | | |

1-definitely will use 2-Might use 3- Probably won't use 4-definitely won't use

9. Whose drugs were they?

1-definitely will use 2-Might use 3- Probably won't use 4-definitely won't use

10. Verify anonymous information with police.

1-definitely will use 2-Might use 3- Probably won't use 4-definitely won't use